

After Final filed on February 20, 2004 is respectfully requested. The following remarks are also respectfully submitted in response to the Examiner's comments in the Continuation Sheet of the March 4, 2004 Advisory Action.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 14-22 are pending.

The Examiner maintains the rejections of claims 1-2 (including claim 3 in page 4 of the Final Office Action) and 4-6 from the previous Office Action under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandegren (US Patent No. 6,512,930) in view of Gutfreund (US Patent No. 6,192,394).

The Examiner maintains the rejections of claims 7-8 and 10-12 from the previous Office Action under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandegren/Gutfreund and further in view of Daly (US Patent No. 6,393,014).

Newly added dependent claims 14-22 appear to be also rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandegren.

The following remarks are respectfully submitted in response to the Examiner's comments in the Continuation Sheet of the Advisory Action mailed March 4, 2004.

In the Continuation Sheet, under the headings FIRST and SECOND, the Examiner asserts that Sandegren's mobile network reads on an "ad hoc network." However, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner, because the term "ad hoc network" defines a local area network in which the network nodes communicate directly with each other for a duration of an established communication session, for example, while in close proximity to each other. A mobile network as disclosed in Sandegren, or to one skilled in the art, refers to a wireless telephone network, which differs from a wireless local area network. See, definition of an ad hoc network. Sandegren does not contemplate using any type of local area network.

Accordingly, one of the benefits of the claimed invention by expressly reciting "an ad hoc local area network," and "a mobile communications network," is that a status of a PC1 user (in FIG. 1) can be transmitted to a PC2 user (in FIG. 1) even though PC1 (which transmits a status)

and PC2 (which receives the status) may not be connected to the same network (i.e., a first user's status is received on "an ad hoc local area network," and a second user receives the first user's status on "a mobile communications network). However, in Sandegren, it is assumed that a plurality of mobile terminals A, B are connected to the same mobile network. Furthermore, a user of mobile terminal A (user A) can know that he/she can make a telephone call to the mobile terminal B only when the mobile terminal B is connected to the mobile network, but, in Sandegren, there is no way for user A to know a status of the mobile terminal B (user B) when the mobile terminal B is not connected to the mobile network. The present invention's configuration that a status of user A is notified to user B even when the user A and B cannot be connected to the same mobile network is not disclosed or suggested in Sandegren or other cited references (i.e., Sandegren and Gutfreund do not disclose or suggest FIG. 1 of the present Application, in which a first user status at PC1 is provided to a second user at PC2, even though PC1 and PC2 are not on the same mobile communications network). In contrast to the Examiner's assertion under the heading SIXTH, Sandegren, Gutfreund, and Daly, either alone or combined, do not disclose or suggest forwarding a status of a first user at a computing device on a first network (ad hoc local area network) through a mobile terminal of the first user to another mobile terminal of a second user on another second network (mobile communications network), as claimed and as shown in FIG. 1 of the present application.

Regarding the Examiner's comment, under the heading THIRD, on ICQ instant messaging and Gutfreund, the Applicants assert that ICQ and Gutfreund do not disclose or suggest generating or determining a status of a first user at a device and transmitting via an ad hoc local area network the status of the first user to a mobile terminal of the first user. In other words, ICQ software does not generate a status of a user, such as "busy," "away," or the like. Further, even if a user used ICQ to send messages to another device owned by the same user, the ICQ still would not achieve the present claimed invention to provide a configuration, in which a status of user A is notified to user B even when the user A and B cannot be connected to the same mobile network, because an ICQ does not contemplate the present invention's use of "an ad hoc local area network" and "a mobile communications network," (i.e., see, FIG. 1 of the present Application, in which a first user status at PC1 is provided to a second user at PC2, even though PC1 and PC2 are not on the same mobile communications network). Furthermore, in ICQ, a user status, such as "busy," "away," and the like, are not generated automatically by a terminal but are set manually by a user from a predetermined list (see, page 3, lines 16-25 of the present Application). Therefore, a configuration to generate a status of a user at a computing device is not included in ICQ.

Regarding the Examiner's comment, under the headings FOURTH and FIFTH, on HRN/WOLN database authorization and mobile terminal storage means, the Applicants assert that the present invention differs from Sandegren as discussed in the Amendment After Final of February 20, 2004. More particularly, the Examiner asserts that in Sandegren, authorization is provided by the HLR/WOLN database. The Examiner also asserts that storage means is inherent since an update to a list infers storage to a previously stored list. However, in regard to the present invention's independent claims 4, 7, 8, 11 and 12, the authorizing process is between the "first information terminal" obtaining a status of a first user and a mobile terminal of the first user receiving its own obtained status via a direct ad hoc local area network communication link (see, FIG. 1 of the present application), so that the mobile terminal of the first user ensures that the same first user whose status is being reported is receiving the status.

Sandegren is absolutely silent on such authorizing process, because the Sandegren authorizing process is between a user and another user using a mobile communications network's HLR/WOLN database (column 7, lines 34-47), which differs from the present invention's mobile terminal that authorizes an external first information terminal connected to the mobile terminal via an ad hoc local area network. In other words, for example, independent claims 8 and 12, directed to a mobile terminal, recite, "storage means for storing user identification information for authorization of an external device that reports a status of the user of the mobile terminal via an ad hoc local area network connection" (claim 8). However, in Sandegren the notification lists, which are a list of other users, are stored in the service node/WOLN database 217 as disclosed in column 5, line 36 to column 7, line 2, and FIGS. 3a, 3d and 3e, and in Sandegren, the mobile terminals use the HLR/WOLN database for authorization services. Further, even if Sandegren's mobile terminal stored information relating to other mobile terminals, it would store its notification list, which differs from the present invention's mobile terminal that stores authorization information to authorize an external device connecting to the mobile terminal via an ad hoc local area network. Therefore, Sandegren's mobile terminals do not have the same configuration of the present claimed invention to store authorization information for authorizing an external device connecting to the mobile terminal via an ad hoc local area network. Therefore, it is believed that independent claims 8 and 12 are allowable.

In view of the remarks and the claim amendments in After Final Amendment of February 20, 2004, it is respectfully believed that the claims are in condition for allowance over Sandegren and Gutfreund. Otherwise, an interview with the Examiner is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3/22/2004

By: 
Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501